

Remarks

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested.

The amended Claim 1 and the added Claim 25 clearly recite the subject matter of the present invention and further distinguish features of the present invention from the cited references. All of the amendments can be supported by the specification of the present invention, and therefore there is no new matter added therein.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Seo in view of Yao. After the amendments in Claim 1, the present invention has a restricting mechanism having a first protrusion disposed on a circumferential surface of the rotary case and a second protrusion *disposed on an inside wall of the annular frame* for limiting the rotary case to rotate in a particular rotating range, whereby when the rotary case rotates in a first direction till the first protrusion is against said second protrusion, a rotation of the rotary case in the first direction is limited. The restricting mechanism of the present invention is different from that of Seo's patent.

The claims 4, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Seo in view of Yao. The plug of the present invention is foldable along a first axis and the rotary case is pivotable for rotating the plug around a second axis. Soe dose not disclose that the plug could be foldable. In Yao's patent, there is neither a concave

storage base nor a rotary case for receiving and rotating a plug.

The claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Seo in view of Yao. Each blade and each conductive terminal of the present invention are integrally formed as recited in the claim 5, however, there is no identical or similar subject matter in Soe and Yao.

Consequently, the components of the present invention are distinct from either Soe's or Yao's patent according to at least above reasons. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claim 1 and claims 2-8 should be patentable over either Soe's or Yao's patents.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The claims 9-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seo in view of Yao and further in view of Yang. The present invention provides a rotatable and foldable plug for being connected to an electronic receptacle, applied in a **power supply apparatus** as recited in the claim 1 or 23, wherein the plug is foldable along a first axis and the rotary case is pivotable for rotating the plug around a second axis.

Yao discloses a **transformer** having a **foldable plug**, in which the fixed pins (24) of the plug (16) are **fixedly connected to the enclosure (2)** (described in lines 16-19 of column 3 of Yao's patent), therefore, the design of Yao's plug is different from the foldable plug of the present invention.

Yang discloses a **night lamp** having a plug thereon and the structure design for receiving a plug into a shell of the night lamp is much more complex and relies on more components than the rotary case and the circle opening of the present invention. With regard to the diameter of the coupling flange (41) asserted by the Examiner, Yang does not point out that the diameter of the coupling flange 41 is smaller than the inside diameter of the annular frame. In addition, annular grooves and annular protrusions of the present invention are different from Yang's coupling flange (41) and an annular coupling groove (33) since the annular grooves and the annular protrusions of the present invention are used for **positioning a direction of the plug**; however, the coupling flange (41) and the annular coupling groove (33) are used for **enabling a body 3 to be rotated on its own axis** (described in lines 1-3 of column 3 of Yang's patent).

Seo discloses an **adaptor** having a rotatable plug without foldable function. However, the features of the restricting mechanism including the first protrusion and the second protrusion of the present invention are absent in Seo's patent.

It is to be noted that the plugs of Yao and Yang are applied respectively in transformers and night lamps; however the present invention is applied in power supplies. Moreover, for the present invention, it is very advantageous that there is a restricting mechanism for limiting said rotary case to rotate in a particular rotating range to prevent the conductive wires from intertwining when the rotary case is rotated. Hence, the applications and functions of the

present invention are apparently different from those of the cited references.

If one skilled in the art would like to combine the three cited references to form a configuration, the **complex annular plate structure (3, 31, 32, 62, 63 and 64) of Yang's night lamp** must be embedded into Seo's adaptor, then it is difficult to assemble these elements in a whole and furthermore it is impossible for such configuration to smoothly rotate. If a foldable plug of Yao's design would be added in such combined configuration, it is impossible for one skilled in the art to put Yao's foldable plug into Yang's annular plate structure. Such combined configuration is incapable of rotating and folding, and further incapable of preventing the conductive wires from intertwining when the rotary case is rotated. Hence, the present invention cannot be achieved just by combining the three cited reference. In other words, the present invention cannot be taught or anticipated by those references because such combination cannot achieve any goals with significant benefits in desired functions, assembly advantage, cost-down issue etc.

Based on at least above reasons, the present invention has many features never shown, taught or suggested in any of the cited references, so that the present invention cannot be achieved even by combining the cited references.

Furthermore, the three cited references are devoid of any suggestion or teaching that they could be combined, but the Examiner improperly relied upon hindsight to arrive at the determination of obviousness. *In re Rijckaert, 9 F. 3d 1531, 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1993)*. Therefore, the claim 23 should

be patentable over the cited references. However, the claims 9-22 and 24 should be patentable owing to their dependency from the patentable claim 1 and claim 23.

The Applicant further adds Claim 25 to emphasize the features of the present invention. It is recited that the plug having a transverse rod, at least two blades and at least two conductive terminals, wherein **each blade and each conductive terminal are integrally formed**. The blade and the conductive terminal are integrated for simplifying the fabrication and reducing the cost of the plug.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, one skilled in the art cannot achieve the present invention through the teaching of Seo even in view of Yao and Yang. Therefore, the present invention is patentable over the cited reference, and reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are earnestly solicited at an early date.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at (408) 451-5902 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

 Reg # 32,186
S. G. Bever

Customer No.: 22888

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,834

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (37 C.F.R. 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: Nov. 5, 2003 Signature: Carrie Reddick